arXiv:1410.2297v1 [math.OC] 8 Oct 2014

ON A FIXED DURATION PURSUIT DIFFERENTIAL GAME WITH GEOMETRIC AND INTEGRAL CONSTRAINTS

MEHDI SALIMI*†, GAFURJAN I. IBRAGIMOV‡, STEFAN SIEGMUND†, SOMAYEH SHARIFI§

†CENTER FOR DYNAMICS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,
TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DRESDEN, 01062 DRESDEN, GERMANY

‡DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH,
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA, 43400 UPM SERDANG, SELANGOR, MALAYSIA

§YOUNG RESEARCHERS AND ELITE CLUB, HAMEDAN BRANCH, ISLAMIC AZAD
UNIVERSITY, HAMEDAN, IRAN

Abstract. In this paper we investigate a differential game in which countably many dynamical objects pursue a single one. All the players perform simple motions. The duration of the game is fixed. The controls of a group of pursuers are subject to geometric constraints and the controls of the other pursuers and the evader are subject to integral constraints. The payoff of the game is the distance between the evader and the closest pursuer when the game is terminated. We construct optimal strategies for players and find the value of the game.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries

Differential game theory comes into play when one wants to study procedures in which one controlled object is pursued by others. There are several types of differential games, but the most common one is the so called pursuit-evasion game. Fundamental researches by Isaacs [5], Krasovskii [7], Pashkov and Teorekhov [8], Petrosyan [9], Pontryagin [10], Rikhsiev [11] and Rzymowski [12] deal with differential games and pursuit evasion problems. Constructing the player's optimal strategies and finding the value of the game are of special interest in the study of differential games. Such problems in case of many pursuers were studied for example, by some of the authors in [1]-[3] and by Ivanov et al. in [6].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 91A23.
Key words and phrases. differential game; pursuer; evader; strategy; value of the game.

*corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: mehdi.salimi@tu-dresden.de

.

Pursuit-evasion games have several applications in robotics such as motion planning in adversarial settings (e.g. playing hide-and-seek) or defining the requirements to achieve a goal in the worst-case performance of robotic systems. As an example imagine a search-and-rescue setting in which the goal is to find a lost person by robots. Treating the problem as a pursuit-evasion game, a pursuit strategy (upon existence) guarantees the rescue of the lost person regardless of his/her movements. Therefore, a worst-case bound on the number of robots required to rescue a lost person can be obtained by considering the person as an adversarial entity trying to evade capture.

In [2] Ibragimov studies a differential game of optimal approach of countably many pursuers to one evader in a Hilbert space with geometric constraints on the controls of the players. Ibragimov and Salimi [3] study such a differential game for inertial players with integral constraints under the assumption that the control resource of the evader is less than that of each pursuer. Evasion from many pursuers in simple motion differential games with integral constraints was investigated by Ibragimov et al. in [4] as well.

In the present paper, motivated by the above developments, we discuss an optimal pursuit problem with countably many pursuers and one evader in the Hilbert space $\ell_2 = \{\alpha = (\alpha_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2 < \infty\}$ with inner product $(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k \beta_k$ and norm $\|\alpha\|_2 := \|\alpha\|_{\ell_2} = \big(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The controls of a group of pursuers are subject to geometric constraints and the controls of the other pursuers and the evader are subject to integral constraints. In section 2 we formulate the problem, give dynamic equations and basic definitions. In section 3 we introduce an auxiliary game and introduce admissible strategy of the pursuer that guaranties it to capture evader, and in section 4 we point out the main theorem that estimate the value of the game. An example to illustrate the theorem conclude the section.

2. Formulation of the Problem

Let $\theta > 0$ be arbitrary, but fixed. For $1 \le p \le \infty$ let $L_p = L_p([0,\theta], \ell_2) = \{f : [0,\theta] \to \ell_2 \,|\, f \text{ is measurable and } \|f\|_{L_p} < \infty\}$ denote the space of L_p functions from $[0,\theta]$ to ℓ_2 with norm $\|f\|_p := \|f\|_{L_p} = \big(\int_0^\theta \|f(t)\|_{\ell_2}^p \, dt\big)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ for $1 \le p < \infty$ and $\|f\|_\infty := \|f\|_{L_\infty} = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t\in[0,\theta]} \|f(t)\|_{\ell_2}$. Then for $1 \le p < q \le \infty$ the inclusions $L_q \subset L_p$ hold. For arbitrary *controls* $v \in L_2$, $u_n \in L_2$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$, and *initial values* $y_0 \in \ell_2$, $x_{n0} \in \ell_2$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$, consider the infinitely many initial value problems

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(P_n): \quad \dot{x}_n = u_n(t), \quad x_n(0) = x_{n0}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},\\
&(E): \quad \dot{y} = v(t), \qquad y(0) = y_0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.1}
$$

on the interval $[0,\theta]$. The solution x_n of (P_n) is an element of the space $AC = AC([0,\theta],\ell_2)$ of absolutely continuous functions from $[0,\theta]$ to ℓ_2. It is given by

$$x_n = \big(x_{nk}\big)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \qquad \text{with} \quad x_{nk}(t) = x_{nk0} + \int_0^t u_{nk}(s)\,ds \quad \text{for} \quad t\in[0,\theta]$$

and is called *motion* of the *pursuer* P_n. The solution $y \in AC$ of (E) is

$$y = \big(y_k\big)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \qquad \text{with} \quad y_k(t) = y_{k0} + \int_0^t v_k(s)\,ds \quad \text{for} \quad t\in[0,\theta]$$

and is called *motion* of the *evader* E.

For a Banach space $(X,\|\cdot\|_X)$ let $B_X(x_0,r) = \{x\in X : \|x-x_0\|\le r\}$ and $S_X(x_0,r) = \{x\in X : \|x-x_0\| = r\}$ denote the ball and sphere of radius r and center x_0, respectively.

Definition 2.1 (Admissible controls)**.** Let $I, J\subset\mathbb{N}$ with $I\cup J=\mathbb{N}$ and $\rho_n>0$ for $n\in\mathbb{N}$. A function $u_n\in L_2$ is called *admissible control for the pursuer* P_n if it satisfies

(a) *Integral constraint for pursuers on* I*:* If $n\in I$ then $u_n\in\mathcal{U}_c^{(n)} := B_{L_2}(0,\rho_n)$, i.e.

$$\Big(\int_0^\theta \sum_{k=1}^\infty u_{nk}(t)^2\,dt\Big)^{\frac12} \le \rho_n.$$

(b) *Geometric constraint for pursuers on* J*:* If $n\in J$ then $u_n\in\mathcal{U}_c^{(n)} := B_{L_\infty}(0,\rho_n)$, i.e.

$$\max_{t\in[0,\theta]}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^\infty u_{nk}(t)^2\Big)^{\frac12} \le \rho_n.$$

Note that w.l.o.g. we replaced the essential supremum over $[0,\theta]$ by max.

$\mathcal{U}_c^{(n)}$ for $n\in\mathbb{N}$ is called the *set of all admissible controls of pursuer* P_n.

Let $\sigma>0$. A function $v\in L_2$ is called *admissible control for the evader* if it satisfies

(c) *Integral constraint for evader:* $v\in\mathcal{V}_c := B_{L_2}(0,\sigma)$, i.e.

$$\Big(\int_0^\theta \sum_{k=1}^\infty v_k(t)^2\,dt\Big)^{\frac12} \le \sigma.$$

$\mathcal{V}_c$ is called the *set of all admissible controls of evader* E.

Definition 2.2 (Admissible strategies)**.** (a) A function

$$U_n : [0,\infty)\times\ell_2\times\ell_2\times\ell_2\to\ell_2, \quad (t,x_n,y,v)\mapsto U_n(t,x_n,y,v) \qquad \text{for } n\in\mathbb{N},$$

is called *strategy of the pursuer* P_n if for any admissible control $v\in\mathcal{V}_c$ of the evader E and any initial values $y_0\in\ell_2$, $x_{n0}\in\ell_2$, the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_n &= U_n(t,x_n,y,v(t)), \quad x_n(0) = x_{n0},\\ \dot{y} &= v(t), \qquad\qquad\qquad\quad y(0) = y_0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

has a unique solution (x_n,y) with $x_n,\ y\in AC$. A strategy U_n is said to be *admissible* if for every solution (x_n,y) the control $u_n(t) := U_n(t,x_n(t),y(t),v(t))$ generated by U_n is

admissible, i.e. $U_n(\cdot, x_n(\cdot), y(\cdot), v(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{U}_c^{(n)}$. The set of all admissible strategies for (2.2) is denoted by $\mathcal{U}^{(n)}$.

(b) A function

$$V : [0, \infty) \times \ell_2^{\mathbb{N}} \to \ell_2, \quad (t, x_1, \dots, x_m, \dots, y) \mapsto V(t, x_1, \dots, x_m, \dots, y)$$

is called *strategy of the evader* E, if for arbitrary admissible controls $u_n \in \mathcal{U}_c^{(n)}$ of the pursuers P_n ($n \in \mathbb{N}$), arbitrary initial values $y_0 \in \ell_2$, $x_{n0} \in \ell_2$, the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_n &= u_n(t), & x_n(0) &= x_{n0}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \dot{y} &= V(t, x_1, \dots, x_m, \dots, y), & y(0) &= y_0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

has a unique solution $(x_1, \dots, x_m, \dots, y)$ with $x_n, y \in AC$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A strategy V is said to be *admissible*, if for every solution $(x_1, \dots, x_m, \dots, y)$ the control $v(t) := V(t, x_1(t), \dots, x_m(t), \dots, y(t))$ generated by V is admissible, i.e. $V(\cdot, x_1(\cdot), \dots, x_m(\cdot), \dots, y(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{V}_c$. The set of all admissible strategies for (2.3) is denoted by $\mathcal{V}$.

Definition 2.3 (Optimal strategies and value of the game)**.** (a) Admissible strategies U_n^* of the pursuers P_n ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) are said to be *optimal* if

$$\inf_{\substack{U_n \in \mathcal{U}^{(n)} \\ \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}}} \Gamma_1(U_1, \dots, U_m, \dots) = \Gamma_1(U_1^*, \dots, U_m^*, \dots),$$

where

$$\Gamma_1(U_1, \dots, U_m, \dots) = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_c} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_n(\theta) - y(\theta)\|$$

and (x_n, y) is the solution of (2.2).

(b) An admissible strategy V^* of the evader E is said to be *optimal* if

$$\sup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} \Gamma_2(V) = \Gamma_2(V^*),$$

where

$$\Gamma_2(V) = \inf_{\substack{u_n \in \mathcal{U}_c^{(n)} \\ \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}}} \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_n(\theta) - y(\theta)\|,$$

and $(x_1, \dots, x_m, \dots, y)$ is the solution of (2.3).

(c) If $\Gamma_1(U_1^*, \dots, U_m^*, \dots) = \Gamma_2(V^*) = \gamma$ then we say that *the game has the value* γ [13].

Our aim is to find optimal strategies U_n^* and V^* of the players P_n and E, respectively, and the value of the game.

3. An Auxiliary Game

The attainability domain of the pursuers P_i and P_j at time θ from the initial state x_{i0} and x_{j0} are the closed balls $B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, \rho_i\sqrt{\theta})$ for $i \in I$ and $B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, \rho_j\theta)$ for $j \in J$, respectively. This is due to the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_i(\theta) - x_{i0}\| &= \Big\| \int_0^\theta u_i(s)\, ds \Big\| \le \int_0^\theta \|u_i(s)\|\, ds \\ &\le \Big(\int_0^\theta 1\, ds \Big)^{1/2} \cdot \Big(\int_0^\theta \|u_i(s)\|^2\, ds \Big)^{1/2} \le \rho_i\sqrt{\theta}, \qquad \text{for } i \in I, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\|x_j(\theta) - x_{j0}\| = \Big\| \int_0^\theta u_j(s)\, ds \Big\| \le \int_0^\theta \|u_j(s)\|\, ds \le \rho_j\theta, \qquad \text{for } j \in J. \tag{3.2}$$

On the other hand, for $i \in I$ an arbitrary $\bar{x} \in B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, \rho_i\sqrt{\theta})$ can be reached by a pursuer P_i with the admissible control $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_c^{(i)}$ defined by

$$u_i(s) = (\bar{x} - x_{i0})/\theta, \quad 0 \le s \le \theta,$$

which implies $x_i(\theta) = \bar{x}$. Moreover, for $j \in J$ an $\bar{x} \in B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, \rho_j\theta)$ can be reached by choosing the admissible control

$$u_j(s) = (\bar{x} - x_{j0})/\theta, \quad 0 \le s \le \theta,$$

for the pursuer P_j, which results in $x_j(\theta) = \bar{x}$.

Similarly, the attainability domain of the evader E at time θ from the initial state y_0 is the closed ball $B_{\ell_2}(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta})$.

For simplicity we consider now the following game with only one pursuer

$$\begin{aligned} (P) &: \dot{x} = u(t), \quad x(0) = x_0, \\ (E) &: \dot{y} = v(t), \quad y(0) = y_0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

and assume at first that the control u satisfies an integral constraint $u \in B_{L_2}(0, \rho)$ for some $\rho > 0$. Define

$$X = \Big\{ z \in \ell_2 : 2(y_0 - x_0, z) \le (\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta + \|y_0\|^2 - \|x_0\|^2 \Big\}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *If $y(\theta) \in X$, then for the game (3.3) with a pursuer which is subject to an integral constraint, there exists an admissible strategy of the pursuer P with $x(\theta) = y(\theta)$.*

Proof. We define the pursuer's strategy as follows:

$$u(t) = \tfrac{1}{\theta}(y_0 - x_0) + v(t), \quad 0 \le t \le \theta. \tag{3.4}$$

We show that if $y(\theta) \in X$, then the above strategy is admissible. Using the fact that

$$y(\theta) = y_0 + \int_0^\theta v(s) ds,$$

then from the inequality

$$2(y_0 - x_0, y(\theta)) \le (\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta + \|y_0\|^2 - \|x_0\|^2,$$

and equality

$$\|y_0 - x_0\|^2 + \|y_0\|^2 - \|x_0\|^2 - 2(y_0 - x_0, y_0) = 0,$$

we obtain

$$2\int_0^\theta (y_0 - x_0, v(s))ds \le (\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta - \|x_0 - y_0\|^2.$$

From (3.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\theta \|u(s)\|^2 ds &= \frac{1}{\theta}\|y_0 - x_0\|^2 + \frac{2}{\theta}\int_0^\theta (y_0 - x_0, v(s))ds + \int_0^\theta \|v(s)\|^2 ds \\ &\le \frac{1}{\theta}\|y_0 - x_0\|^2 + \frac{1}{\theta}\left((\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta - \|x_0 - y_0\|^2\right) + \sigma^2 = \rho^2,\end{aligned}$$

therefore strategy (3.4) is admissible. Then

$$x(\theta) = x_0 + \int_0^\theta u(s)ds = x_0 + y_0 - x_0 + \int_0^\theta v(s)ds = y(\theta). \qquad \square$$

Now consider the second case and assume that the pursuer's control u is subject to a geometric constraint $u \in B_{L_\infty}(0, \rho)$ for some $\rho > 0$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\sigma \le \rho$ and $y(\theta) \in X$, then for the game (3.3) with a pursuer which is subject to a geometric constraint, there exists an admissible strategy of the pursuer P with $x(\theta) = y(\theta)$.*

Proof. We introduce the pursuer's strategy as follows:

$$u(t) = \begin{cases} v(t) - (v(t), e)e + e\big(\rho^2 - \sigma^2 + (v(t), e)^2\big)^{1/2}, & \text{if} \quad 0 \le t \le \tau, \\ v(t), & \text{if} \quad \tau < t \le \theta, \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

where $e = (y_0 - x_0)/(\|y_0 - x_0\|)$ and $\tau \in [0, \theta]$ is the time instant at which $x(\tau) = y(\tau)$ for the first time.

We have $y(t) - x(t) = ef(t)$, where

$$f(t) = \|y_0 - x_0\| + \int_0^t (v(s), e)\, ds - \int_0^t \big(\rho^2 - \sigma^2 + (v(s), e)^2\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds.$$

Clearly, $f(0) = \|y_0 - x_0\| > 0$. Let us show that $f(\theta) \le 0$. This will imply that $f(\tau) = 0$ for some $\tau \in [0, \theta]$.

Consider the two-dimensional vector function $g(t) = \big((\rho^2 - \sigma^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, (v(t), e)\big)$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\theta \big(\rho^2 - \sigma^2 + (v(t), e)^2\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds &= \int_0^\theta |g(s)|ds \ge \Big|\int_0^\theta g(s)ds\Big| \\ &= \Big((\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta^2 + \Big(\int_0^\theta (v(s), e)ds\Big)^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$f(\theta) \le \|y_0 - x_0\| + \int_0^\theta (v(s), e)ds - \Big((\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta^2 + \Big(\int_0^\theta (v(s), e)ds\Big)^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.6}$$

By assumption $y(\theta) \in X$. Consequently, $(e, y(\theta)) \le d$, where

$$d = \big((\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta^2 + \|y_0\|^2 - \|x_0\|^2\big)/(2\|y_0 - x_0\|).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\int_0^\theta (v(s), e)ds \le d - (y_0, e). \tag{3.7}$$

On the other hand the function $\phi(t) = \|y_0 - x_0\| + t - ((\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta^2 + t^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is increasing on $\mathbb{R}$. Then it follows from (3.6) and (3.7) that

$$f(\theta) \le \|y_0 - x_0\| + d - (y_0, e) - \big((\rho^2 - \sigma^2)\theta^2 + (d - (y_0, e))^2\big)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.$$

Consequently, $f(\tau) = 0$ for some $\tau \in [0, \theta]$. Therefore, $x(\tau) = y(\tau)$. Further, by (3.5), $u(t) = v(t)$ for $\tau \le t \le \theta$. Then, obviously, $x(\theta) = y(\theta)$. □

4. Main Result

Now consider the game (2.1). We will solve the optimal pursuit problem under the following assumption.

Assumption (A) [2]. *There exists a nonzero vector p_0 such that $(y_0 - x_{n0}, p_0) \ge 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

For $l \ge 0$ define

$$\begin{aligned} G_i(l) &:= B_{\ell_2}\big(x_{i0}, \rho_i\sqrt{\theta} + l\big), \quad \text{for } i \in I, \\ G_j(l) &:= B_{\ell_2}\big(x_{j0}, \rho_j\theta + l\big), \qquad \text{for } j \in J, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

therefore

$$\gamma = \inf\Big\{l \ge 0 : B_{\ell_2}\big(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta}\big) \subset \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} G_n(l)\Big\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Theorem 4.1. *Under the assumption (A) and if $\sigma\theta \le \rho_j\theta + \gamma$ for all $j \in J$, then the number γ given by (4.2) is the value of game (2.1).*

The proof of Theorem 4.1 relies on the following lemmas for which we let $y_0, x_{n0} \in \ell_2$ with $x_{n0} \ne y_0$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and choose $r, R_n > 0$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 4.2 ([2])**.** *Let*

$$X_n = \Big\{z \in l_2 : 2(y_0 - x_{n0}, z) \le R_n^2 - r^2 + \|y_0\|^2 - \|x_{n0}\|^2\Big\}.$$

Under the assumption (A) and if

$$B_{\ell_2}(y_0, r) \subset \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_{\ell_2}(x_{n0}, R_n),$$

then $B_{\ell_2}(y_0, r) \subset \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} X_n$.

Lemma 4.3 ([2])**.** *Let* $R_0 := \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} R_n$. *Under the assumption (A) and if* $R_0 > 0$ *and if for any* $\varepsilon \in (0, R_0)$ *the set* $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_{\ell_2}(x_{n0}, R_n - \varepsilon)$ *does not contain the ball* $B_{\ell_2}(y_0, r)$, *then there exists a point* $\bar{y} \in S_{\ell_2}(y_0, r)$ *such that* $\|\bar{y} - x_{n0}\| \geq R_n$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We assume that

$$K = \big\{n \in \mathbb{N} : S_{\ell_2}(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta}) \cap G_n(\gamma) \neq \emptyset\big\}, \tag{4.3}$$

and consider the infinitely many initial value problems

$$\begin{aligned} &(P_k): \quad \dot{x}_k = u_k(t), \quad x_k(0) = x_{k0}, \quad k \in K, \\ &(P_{\hat{k}}): \quad \dot{x}_{\hat{k}} = 0, \qquad\qquad\qquad\quad \hat{k} \in \mathbb{N} \setminus K, \\ &(E): \quad \dot{y} = v(t), \qquad y(0) = y_0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

on the interval $[0, \theta]$. The value γ of this game is the same as for the game (2.1). Indeed by the definition of γ, we have

$$B_{\ell_2}\big(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta}\big) \subset \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} G_n(\gamma),$$

therefore

$$B_{\ell_2}\big(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta}\big) \subset \bigcup_{n\in K} G_n(\gamma).$$

For arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ we introduce fictitious pursuers z_n, whose motions are described by the equations

$$\dot{z}_n = w_n^\varepsilon, \quad z_n(0) = x_{n0}, \qquad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N} = I \cup J,$$

with integral constraint on I

$$\|w_i^\varepsilon\|_{L_2} = \Big(\int_0^\theta \|w_i^\varepsilon(t)\|^2\, dt\Big)^{1/2} \leq \bar{\rho}_i(\varepsilon) := \rho_i + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{\theta}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_i\sqrt{\theta}}, \qquad \text{for } i \in I, \tag{4.5}$$

and with geometric constraint on J

$$\|w_j^\varepsilon\|_{L_\infty} = \max_{t\in[0,\theta]} \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_{jk}(t)^2\Big)^{1/2} \leq \bar{\rho}_j(\varepsilon) := \rho_j + \frac{\gamma}{\theta} + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_j\theta}, \qquad \text{for } j \in J, \tag{4.6}$$

where $k_i = \max\{1, \rho_i\}$, and $k_j = \max\{1, \rho_j\}$. It is obvious that the attainability domains of the fictitious pursuers z_i, $i \in I$, and z_j, $j \in J$, at time θ from the initial states x_{i0} and x_{j0} are the balls $B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, \bar{\rho}_i(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\theta}) = B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, \rho_i\sqrt{\theta} + \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_i})$ and $B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, \bar{\rho}_j(\varepsilon)\theta) = B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, \rho_j\theta + \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_j})$.

It can be shown that the attainability domain of the fictitious pursuers from the initial position x_{n0} up to time θ is a ball $G_n(\gamma)$. We define $\widetilde{I} = I \cap K$ and $\widetilde{J} = J \cap K$ and strategies of the fictitious pursuers z_i for $i \in \widetilde{I}$ as follows:

$$w_i^{\varepsilon}(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\theta}(y_0 - x_{i0}) + v(t), & \text{if } 0 \le t \le \tau_i^{\varepsilon}, \\ 0, & \text{if } \tau_i^{\varepsilon} < t \le \theta, \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

where $\tau_i^{\varepsilon} \in [0, \theta]$ is the time for which

$$\int_0^{\tau_i^{\varepsilon}} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(s)\|^2 ds = \bar{\rho}_i^2(\varepsilon), \tag{4.8}$$

if such a time exists. Since $\bar{\rho}_i(\varepsilon) > \bar{\rho}_i(0) := \bar{\rho}_i$, we get

$$\int_0^{\tau_i^{\varepsilon}} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(s)\|^2 ds = \bar{\rho}_i^2(\varepsilon) > \bar{\rho}_i^2 = \int_0^{\tau_i} \|w_i^0(s)\|^2 ds := \int_0^{\tau_i} \|w_i(s)\|^2 ds,$$

that is,

$$\int_0^{\tau_i^{\varepsilon}} \left\| \frac{y_0 - x_{i0}}{\theta} + v(t) \right\|^2 ds > \int_0^{\tau_i} \left\| \frac{y_0 - x_{i0}}{\theta} + v(t) \right\|^2 ds,$$

hence $\tau_i^{\varepsilon} > \tau_i$.

Also we define the strategies of the fictitious pursuers z_j for $j \in \widetilde{J}$ as follows:

$$w_j^{\varepsilon}(t) = \begin{cases} v(t) - (v(t), e_j)\, e_j + e_j \left(\bar{\rho}_j^2(\varepsilon) - \sigma^2 + (v(t), e_j)^2 \right)^{1/2}, & \text{if} \quad 0 \le t \le \tau_j, \\ v(t), & \text{if} \quad \tau_j \le t \le \theta, \end{cases} \tag{4.9}$$

where $e_j = (y_0 - x_{j0})/\|y_0 - x_{j0}\|$ and $\tau_j \in [0, \theta]$ is the time at which $z_j(\tau_j) = y(\tau_j)$ for the first time, if it exists.

Now we define the strategies of the pursuers x_i, $i \in \widetilde{I}$, and x_j, $j \in \widetilde{J}$, by the strategies of the fictitious pursuers as follows:

$$u_n(t) = \frac{\rho_n \theta^{\xi}}{\rho_n \theta^{\xi} + \gamma} w_n(t), \qquad 0 \le t \le \theta, \tag{4.10}$$

$$\text{with} \quad \xi = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } n \in \tilde{I}, \\ 1, & \text{if } n \in \tilde{J}, \end{cases}$$

as well as $u_n(t) = 0$ for $t \in [0, \theta]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus K$.

We show now that constructed strategies $u_i(t) = \dfrac{\rho_i \sqrt{\theta}}{\rho_i \sqrt{\theta} + \gamma} w_i(t)$ in (4.10) for the pursuers P_i, $i \in \widetilde{I}$, satisfy the inequalities

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_c} \inf_{i \in \widetilde{I}} \|y(\theta) - x_i(\theta)\| \le \gamma. \tag{4.11}$$

By the definition of γ, we have

$$B_{\ell_2}\big(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta}\big) \subset \bigcup_{i \in \widetilde{I}} B_{\ell_2}\big(x_{i0}, \rho_i \sqrt{\theta} + \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_i}\big).$$

By assumption, the inequality $(y_0 - x_{i0}, p_0) \geq 0$ holds for all $i \in \widetilde{I}$. Then it follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$B_{\ell_2}\big(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta}\big) \subset \bigcup_{i\in\widetilde{I}} X_i^{\varepsilon},$$

where

$$X_i^{\varepsilon} = \Big\{z \in \ell_2 : 2(y_0 - x_{i0}, z) \leq \big(\rho_i\sqrt{\theta} + \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_i}\big)^2 - \sigma^2\theta + \|y_0\|^2 - \|x_{i0}\|^2\Big\}.$$

Consequently, the point $y(\theta) \in B_{\ell_2}(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta})$ belongs to some half-space $X_s^{\varepsilon}, s = s(\varepsilon) \in \widetilde{I}$, and we have

$$2(y_0 - x_{s0}, y(\theta)) \leq \big(\rho_s\sqrt{\theta} + \gamma + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_s}\big)^2 - \sigma^2\theta + \|y_0\|^2 - \|x_{s0}\|^2. \tag{4.12}$$

By Lemma 3.1 for the strategies (4.7) of fictitious pursuers we get $z_s(\theta) = y(\theta)$. Then taking into account (4.5) and (4.10) with $\xi = \frac{1}{2}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|y(\theta) - x_s(\theta)\| = \|z_s(\theta) - x_s(\theta)\| &= \Big\| \int_0^{\theta} \Big(w_s^{\varepsilon}(t) - \frac{\rho_s}{\bar{\rho}_s} w_s(t)\Big)\, dt\Big\| \\ &\leq \int_0^{\theta} \|w_s^{\varepsilon}(t) - w_s(t)\|\, dt + \int_0^{\theta} \|w_s(t) - \frac{\rho_s}{\bar{\rho}_s} w_s(t)\|\, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Now we put aside the right-hand side of the last inequality. Let us show that

$$\int_0^{\theta} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t) - w_i(t)\| dt \leq K_1\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in \widetilde{I}. \tag{4.14}$$

Indeed, as we show that $\tau_i^{\varepsilon} > \tau_i$ and according to (4.7) $w_i^{\varepsilon}(t) = w_i(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \tau_i$, $w_i(t) = 0$ for $t > \tau_i$, $w_i^{\varepsilon}(t) = 0$ for $t > \tau_i^{\varepsilon}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\theta} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t) - w_i(t)\| dt &= \int_0^{\tau_i} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t) - w_i(t)\| dt + \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_i^{\varepsilon}} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t) - w_i(t)\| dt \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau_i^{\varepsilon}}^{\theta} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t) - w_i(t)\| dt \\ &= \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_i^{\varepsilon}} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t)\| dt \leq \sqrt{\tau_i^{\varepsilon} - \tau_i}\Big(\int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_i^{\varepsilon}} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t)\|^2 dt\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\theta}\Big(\int_0^{\tau_i^{\varepsilon}} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t)\|^2 dt - \int_0^{\tau_i} \|w_i^{\varepsilon}(t)\|^2 dt\Big)^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{\theta}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{k_i\sqrt{\theta}}\Big(2\rho_i + \frac{2\gamma}{\sqrt{\theta}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_i\sqrt{\theta}}\Big)\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\leq K_1\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where K_1 is some positive number.

For the second integral in (4.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| \int_0^\theta \Big(1-\frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}\Big)w_s(t)\Big\| &\le \Big(1-\frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}\Big)\int_0^\theta \|w_s(t)\|dt\\ &\le \Big(1-\frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}\Big)\Big(\int_0^\theta dt\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_0^\theta \|\,w_s(t)\|^2dt\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\le \Big(1-\frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}\Big)\sqrt{\theta}\bar\rho_s=\gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Then from (4.13) it follows that $\|y(\theta)-x_s(\theta)\|\le\gamma+K_1\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Thus, if the pursuers use the strategies (4.10) with $\xi=\frac{1}{2}$, the inequality (4.11) holds.

Now we show that the strategies $u_j(t)=\dfrac{\rho_j\theta}{\rho_j\theta+\gamma}w_j(t)$ constructed in (4.10) of the pursuers P_j for $j\in\widetilde{J}$ satisfy the inequality

$$\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}_c}\inf_{j\in\widetilde{J}}\|y(\theta)-x_j(\theta)\|\le\gamma. \tag{4.15}$$

By the definition of γ, we have

$$B_{\ell_2}\big(y_0,\sigma\sqrt{\theta}\big)\subset\bigcup_{j\in\widetilde{J}}B_{\ell_2}\big(x_{j0},\rho_j\theta+\gamma+\frac{\varepsilon}{k_j}\big).$$

By assumption, the inequality $(y_0-x_{j0},p_0)\ge 0$ holds for all $j\in\widetilde{J}$. Then it follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$B_{\ell_2}\big(y_0,\sigma\sqrt{\theta}\big)\subset\bigcup_{j\in\widetilde{J}}X_j^\varepsilon,$$

where

$$X_j^\varepsilon=\Big\{z\in\ell_2:2(y_0-x_{j0},z)\le\big(\rho_j\theta+\gamma+\frac{\varepsilon}{k_j}\big)^2-\sigma^2\theta+\|y_0\|^2-\|x_{j0}\|^2\Big\}.$$

Consequently, the point $y(\theta)\in B(y_0,\sigma\sqrt{\theta})$ belongs to some half-space X_s^ε, $s=s(\varepsilon)\in\widetilde{J}$. By the assumption of the Theorem 4.1, $\bar\rho_j(\varepsilon)>\sigma$; then it follows from Lemma 3.2 that if z_j uses strategies (4.9) then $z_s(\theta)=y(\theta)$. By taking account of (4.10) with $\xi=1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|y(\theta)-x_s(\theta)\|=\|z_s(\theta)-x_s(\theta)\|&=\Big\|\int_0^\theta\big(w_s^\varepsilon(t)-\frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}w_s(t)\big)\,dt\Big\|\\ &\le\int_0^\theta\|w_s^\varepsilon(t)-w_s(t)\|\,dt+\int_0^\theta\|w_s(t)-\frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}w_s(t)\|\,dt.\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Now we show that the first term of the right-hand side of the inequality satisfies

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\sup_{j\in\widetilde{J}}\int_0^\theta\|w_j^\varepsilon(t)-w_j(t)\|dt=0. \tag{4.17}$$

If there exists $\tau_j \in [0,\theta]$, mentioned in (4.9), then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\theta \|w_j^\varepsilon(t) - w_j(t)\|dt \\
&= \int_0^{\tau_j} \Big(\big((\bar\rho_j^2(\varepsilon) - \sigma^2) + (v(t), e_j)^2\big)^{1/2} - \big((\bar\rho_j^2 - \sigma^2) + (v(t), e_j)^2\big)^{1/2} \Big)^2 dt \\
&\le \int_0^{\tau_j} \big((\bar\rho_j^2(\varepsilon) - \sigma^2)^{1/2} - (\bar\rho_j^2 - \sigma^2)^{1/2}\big)^2 dt \\
&\le \int_0^{\theta} \big((\bar\rho_j^2(\varepsilon) - \sigma^2)^{1/2} - (\bar\rho_j^2 - \sigma^2)^{1/2}\big)^2 dt \\
&= \theta\big((\bar\rho_j^2(\varepsilon) - \sigma^2)^{1/2} - (\bar\rho_j^2 - \sigma^2)^{1/2}\big)^2 \\
&\le \theta\big(\big(\bar\rho_j^2 - \sigma^2 + \big(\frac{\varepsilon}{k_j\theta}\big)^2 + \frac{2\bar\rho_j\varepsilon}{k_j\theta}\big)^{1/2} - (\bar\rho_j^2 - \sigma^2)^{1/2}\big)^2 \\
&\le \theta\big(\big(\frac{\varepsilon}{k_j\theta}\big)^2 + \frac{2\bar\rho_j\varepsilon}{k_j\theta}\big) \le \varepsilon\big(\frac{\varepsilon}{\theta} + 2\big(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\theta}\big)\big) = K_2\varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where K_2 is some positive number.

For the second integral in (4.16) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\theta \big\|\big(1 - \frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}\big) w_s(t)\big\| dt &= \big(1 - \frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}\big) \int_0^\theta \| w_s(t)\| dt \\
&\le \big(1 - \frac{\rho_s}{\bar\rho_s}\big)\bar\rho_s\theta = \gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from (4.16) that $\|y(\theta) - x_s(\theta)\| \le \gamma + K_2\varepsilon$. Thus if the pursuers use strategies (4.10) with $\xi = 1$, the inequality (4.15) holds.

We construct the evader's strategies ensuring that

$$\inf_{\substack{u_n \in \mathcal{U}_c^{(n)} \\ \text{for } n\in K}} \inf_{i\in\widetilde I} \|y(\theta) - x_i(\theta)\| \ge \gamma, \tag{4.18}$$

and

$$\inf_{\substack{u_n \in \mathcal{U}_c^{(n)} \\ \text{for } n\in K}} \inf_{j\in\widetilde J} \|y(\theta) - x_j(\theta)\| \ge \gamma, \tag{4.19}$$

First, if $\gamma = 0$, then inequality (4.18) is obviously valid for any admissible control of the evader. Let $\gamma > 0$. By the definition of γ, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the set

$$\bigcup_{i\in\widetilde I} B_{\ell_2}\big(x_{i0}, \rho_i\sqrt{\theta} + \gamma - \varepsilon\big),$$

does not contain the ball $B_{\ell_2}(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta})$. Then, by Lemma 4.3 there exists a point $\bar y \in S_{\ell_2}(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta})$, such that $\|\bar y - x_{i0}\| \ge \rho_i\sqrt{\theta} + \gamma$. On the other hand

$$\|x_i(\theta) - x_{i0}\| \le \rho_i\sqrt{\theta}.$$

Consequently

$$\|\bar{y} - x_i(\theta)\| \geq \|\bar{y} - x_{i0}\| - \|x_i(\theta) - x_{i0}\| \geq \rho_i\sqrt{\theta} + \gamma - \rho_i\sqrt{\theta} = \gamma.$$

Then the value of the game is not less than γ, and inequality (4.18) holds. Similarly these relationships can be proved for $j \in \widetilde{J}$.

Therefore

$$\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}_c} \inf_{n\in K} \|y(\theta) - x_n(\theta)\| \leq \gamma,$$

and

$$\inf_{\substack{u_n\in\mathcal{U}_c^{(n)} \\ \text{for } n\in K}} \inf_{n\in K} \|y(\theta) - x_n(\theta)\| \geq \gamma.$$

The proof of the theorem is complete. □

Now, we provide an example to illustrate Theorem 4.1.

Example 4.4. Let $\rho_i = 2$, $\rho_j = 1$, $\theta = 9$ and $\sigma = 2$. We consider the following initial positions $x_{i0} = (0, \ldots, 0, 3, 0, \ldots)$, $x_{j0} = (0, \ldots, 0, 8, 0, \ldots)$ and $y_0 = (0, 0, \ldots)$ of the players, where number 3 is ith coordinate of the point x_{i0} and number 8 is jth coordinate of the point x_{j0}. Let us obtain the value of the game. To this end, it is sufficient to show that

1) for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the inclusion $B_{\ell_2}(O, 6) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, 6.7 + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_i})$ holds, where O is the origin and $k_i = \max\{1, \rho_i\} = 2$.

1*) for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the inclusion $B_{\ell_2}(O, 6) \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, 10 + \frac{\varepsilon}{k_j})$ holds, where $k_j = \max\{1, \rho_j\} = 1$.

2) the ball $B_{\ell_2}(O, 6)$ is not contained in the set $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, 6.7)$.

2*) the ball $B_{\ell_2}(O, 6)$ is not contained in the set $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, 10)$.

Let $z = (z_1, z_2, \ldots)$ be an arbitrary point of the ball $B_{\ell_2}(O, 6)$. So $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} z_i^2 \leq 36$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z_j^2 \leq 36$. Then, either the vector z has a nonnegative coordinate or all the coordinate of the vector z are negative. In the former case, z has a nonnegative coordinate z_k. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\|z - x_{k0}\| &= \left(z_1^2 + \ldots + z_{k-1}^2 + (3 - z_k)^2 + z_{k+1}^2 + \ldots\right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} z_i^2 + 9 - 6z_k\right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq (45 - 3z_k)^{1/2} \leq 6.7 < 6.7 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $z \in B_{\ell_2}(x_{k0}, 6.7 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$.

And, z has a nonnegative coordinate $z_{k'}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\|z - x_{k'0}\| &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z_j^2 + 64 - 16z_{k'}\right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq (100 - 16z_{k'})^{1/2} \leq 10 < 10 + \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $z \in B_{\ell_2}(x_{k'0}, 10+\varepsilon)$.
In the latter case, since $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} z_i^2$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z_j^2$ are convergent then $z_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and $z_{k'} \to 0$ as $k' \to \infty$ therefore

$$\|z - x_{k0}\| = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} z_i^2 + 9 - 6z_k\right)^{1/2} \leq (45 - 6z_k)^{1/2} < 6.7 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

and

$$\|z - x_{k'0}\| = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z_j^2 + 64 - 16z_{k'}\right)^{1/2} \leq (100 - 16z_{k'})^{1/2} < 10 + \varepsilon,$$

for any index k and k'. On the other hand, any point $z \in S(O,6)$ with negative coordinate does not belong to the set $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, 6.7)$ and $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, 10)$, since for any numbers i and j

$$\|z - x_{i0}\| = (45 - 6z_i)^{1/2} > 6.7.$$

and

$$\|z - x_{j0}\| = (100 - 16z_j)^{1/2} > 10.$$

So, we have

$$\inf\left\{l \geq 0 : \ B_{\ell_2}(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta}) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, \rho_i\sqrt{\theta} + l)\right\} =$$

$$\inf\left\{l \geq 0 : \ B_{\ell_2}(O, 6) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{i0}, 6 + l)\right\} = 0.7,$$

and

$$\inf\left\{l \geq 0 : \ B_{\ell_2}(y_0, \sigma\sqrt{\theta}) \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, \rho_j\theta + l)\right\} =$$

$$\inf\left\{l \geq 0 : \ B_{\ell_2}(O, 6) \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_{\ell_2}(x_{j0}, 9 + l)\right\} = 1.$$

Therefore, the number

$$\gamma = \min\left\{0.7, \ 1\right\} = 0.7,$$

is the value of the game.

Conclusion. We considered a fixed duration pursuit-evasion problem with countably many pursuers and one evader in the Hilbert space. The controls of a group of pursuers are subject to geometric constraints and the controls of the other pursuers and the evader are subject to integral constraints. We fixed the index i on pursuers and constructed an admissible strategy for the pursuer that guaranties it to capture the evader. Moreover, by taking contribution from an auxiliary differential game under an important assumption we guessed the value of the game and then we proved the accuracy of our guess.

References

[1] Ibragimov, G.I., A game of optimal pursuit of one object by several, Journal of Applied Mathematics and Machanics, 1998, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 187-192.

[2] Ibragimov, G.I., Optimal pursuit with countably many pursuers and one evader, Differential Equations, 2005, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 627-635.

[3] Ibragimov, G.I., Salimi, M., Pursuit-evasion differential game with many inertial players, Mathematical Problems in Engineering, 2009, vol. 2009, Article ID 653723, 15 pages.

[4] Ibragimov, G.I., Salimi, M., Amini, M., Evasion from many pursuers in simple motion differential game with integral constraints, European Journal of Operational Research, 2012, vol. 218, pp. 505-511.

[5] Isaacs, R., Differential Games, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, USA, 1965.

[6] Ivanov, R.P., Ledyayev, Yu.S., Optimality of pursuit time in differential game of many objects with simple motion, Trudi MIAN USSR., Russia, 1981, vol. 158, pp. 87-97.

[7] Krasovskii, N.N., Control of a Dynamical System, Nauka, Moscow, 1985.

[8] Pashkov, A.G., Teorekhov, S.D., On a game of optimal pursuit of one object by two objects, Prikl. Mat. Mekh., 1983, vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 898-903.

[9] Petrosyan, L.A., Differential Pursuit Games, Izdat. Leningrad. Univ., Leningrad, 1977.

[10] Pontryagin, L.S., Selected Works, Moscow: MAKS Press., 2004.

[11] Rikhsiev, B.B., The Differential Games with Simple Motions (in Russian). Tashkent: Fan, 1989.

[12] Rzymowski, W., Evasion along each trajectory in differential games with many pursuers, Journal of Differential Equations, 1986, vol. 62, pp. 334-356.

[13] Subbotin, A.I., Chentsov, A.G., Optimization of Guaranteed Result in Control Problems, Nauka, Moscow, 1981.